

Legislative
Assembly
of Ontario



Assemblée
législative
de l'Ontario

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

F-58

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

F-58

**Standing Committee on
Finance and Economic Affairs**

Building a Better Ontario Act
(Budget Measures), 2024

1st Session
43rd Parliament

Wednesday 8 May 2024

**Comité permanent
des finances
et des affaires économiques**

Loi de 2024 visant à bâtir
un Ontario meilleur
(mesures budgétaires)

1^{re} session
43^e législature

Mercredi 8 mai 2024

Chair: Ernie Hardeman
Clerk: Vanessa Kattar

Président : Ernie Hardeman
Greffière : Vanessa Kattar

Hansard on the Internet

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. The address is:

<https://www.ola.org/>

Index inquiries

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7400.

Le Journal des débats sur Internet

L'adresse pour faire paraître sur votre ordinateur personnel le Journal et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative en quelques heures seulement après la séance est :

Renseignements sur l'index

Adressez vos questions portant sur des numéros précédents du Journal des débats au personnel de l'index, qui vous fourniront des références aux pages dans l'index cumulatif, en composant le 416-325-7400.

House Publications and Language Services
Room 500, West Wing, Legislative Building
111 Wellesley Street West, Queen's Park
Toronto ON M7A 1A2
Telephone 416-325-7400
Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario



Service linguistique et des publications parlementaires
Salle 500, aile ouest, Édifice du Parlement
111, rue Wellesley ouest, Queen's Park
Toronto ON M7A 1A2
Téléphone, 416-325-7400
Publié par l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

CONTENTS

Wednesday 8 May 2024

Building a Better Ontario Act (Budget Measures), 2024, Bill 180, Mr. Bethlenfalvy / Loi de 2024 visant à bâtir un Ontario meilleur (mesures budgétaires), projet de loi 180, M. Bethlenfalvy	F-1847
--	--------

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON
FINANCE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS**

**COMITÉ PERMANENT DES FINANCES
ET DES AFFAIRES ÉCONOMIQUES**

Wednesday 8 May 2024

Mercredi 8 mai 2024

The committee met at 0901 in room 151.

**BUILDING A BETTER ONTARIO ACT
(BUDGET MEASURES), 2024**

**LOI DE 2024 VISANT À BÂTIR
UN ONTARIO MEILLEUR
(MESURES BUDGÉTAIRES)**

Consideration of the following bill:

Bill 180, An Act to implement Budget measures and to enact and amend various statutes / Projet de loi 180, Loi visant à mettre en oeuvre les mesures budgétaires et à édicter et à modifier diverses lois.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): Good morning, everyone. I call this meeting of the Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs to order. We're meeting today for clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 180, An Act to implement Budget measures and to enact and amend various statutes.

Tara Partington from the legislative counsel is here to assist us with our work should you have any questions. We also have ministry staff joining us on Zoom from the Ministry of Finance. A copy of the amendments filed with the Clerk has been distributed electronically. A hard copy has also been provided to you.

Before we begin with consideration of specific sections of the bill and accompanying schedules, I will allow members to make comments to the bill as a whole. Afterwards, debate will be limited to the specific amendment, section or schedule under consideration.

Committee members, pursuant to standing order 83, are there any comments or questions to the bill as a whole?

MPP Fife.

Ms. Catherine Fife: Good morning, everyone. We're looking forward to speaking to the amendments that we've brought forward. Obviously, we are limited in the amendments that we can bring forward as it relates to the act and schedules of the act. If we had more flexibility, if the rules were different, if it was a different time, we would seriously be amending Bill 180, but we'll look forward to the government's support on the amendments that we've brought forward already.

To date, the government has claimed that this is a budget bill that meets the needs of Ontarians, that meets the moment. Obviously, we disagree. It's not that surprising that we disagree. I'm just going to go through a couple of points. I was going to read the whole dissenting opinion, but I'm

not going to do that this morning. I am, however, going to highlight some specific areas just for context and also for future consideration, because the fall economic statement is an opportunity to correct some of the issues that were missed in Bill 180 and the budget bill.

One of the key issues that is facing Ontarians today is the housing crisis and this budget failed to meet that moment. We heard from really informed voices on the housing file who essentially begged this government to get back into the business of building non-market housing and directly invest in the creation of affordable and supportive housing. This is an important part of the housing continuum that the government continues to neglect.

The other issue that we heard very strongly through delegations is the plight of those who live with disabilities in Ontario. There was a call to double the ODSP rates, but the government seems content, if you will, to allow those people who are very vulnerable to live in legislated poverty.

Under the health care and the caring economy, under primary care, the OMA brought forward tangible operational solutions to their work overload and their work culture, which is causing doctors to leave Ontario and to leave the profession. In this regard, the 2.3 million Ontarians who don't have a family doctor are not well-served and, within the next five years, we'll be at 4.6 million Ontarians that don't have a doctor. According to the OMA, "It is essential that these solutions are adopted and implemented in the 2024-25 provincial budget to ensure that at least 50% of Ontarians have access to adequate care by March 31, 2026." Those solutions were not a part or re-sourced or funded through this budget bill.

In northern Ontario, the north absolutely felt abandoned and ignored by budget 2024. For northern communities, particularly on the housing file, the need is urgent and dire: "At a time when health care needs in these communities are increasing, half of the physicians working in northern Ontario are expected to retire in the next five years."

For a government that talks about the economy and stabilizing the economy, for northern communities, having a doctor is an anchor to the economy. It stabilizes those communities. People will not relocate for work or school if they do not have a family physician, and this is a common theme across Ontario. However, it's definitely impacting the north even more so.

On the emergency room crisis in Ontario, in my almost 12 years here, I've never seen a year where we saw 203 emergency department closures, largely due to a nurses'

shortage. The government obviously has a poor track record as it relates to Bill 124. That has since been repealed, but there is a solution that could have been funded in budget 2024, which is implementing, operationalizing and resourcing nurse-to-patient ratios, which changes the culture of nursing and the experience of nursing. Nurses want to be able to do hands-on care. Right now, when I meet with nurses, they are leaving their shifts frustrated and disappointed that they're not able to reach their full potential as nurses.

On the safe consumption sites, this government's stubbornness on doubling down on the stigma around those who suffer from addiction and failing to meet the investment in these services—which, I would say, directs individuals who are in crisis away from hospital emergency rooms. This is something that we should be focused on and working together on. The fact that, despite the disproportionate number of overdoses in northern Ontario, there are only three safe consumption sites and only one is provincially funded, this is a smart investment in preventing acute care hospitals from dealing with those who are in crisis. It's a smart investment because the return on investment is that we're not continuing to overload emergency rooms and hospitals.

We have spoken often on the issue of mental health. The focus should be on supporting community alternative destination clinics to, once again, also alleviate some of the pressure on our emergency rooms. People who are in a mental health crisis are not well served by an emergency room. In fact, it sometimes makes things worse. So pooling some funding into the community so that people are better served when they're in crisis—when they have the courage to actually ask for help—and receive it in community, that should be the model that should be funded in Ontario.

On the senior file, I think seniors in Ontario right now are feeling—well, I know that they are, because I met with them recently. They are dealing with an affordability crisis, particularly senior women who didn't have the financial backing or the security because of generational issues. What they are saying right now is that they do not want to end up in a long-term-care home because they are afraid of ending up in long-term care. So institutional care is not the model that seniors want in Ontario. But they do want—and we heard this—funding to actually make their homes accessible. They want a home care system that actually works, so that people can stay in their homes and live with dignity, and sometimes stay with their partner.

As you know, Chair, I have the Till Death Do Us Part act that has been at committee for 450 days. There has to be a way for us to agree, despite the fact that we are far apart on many issues. The fact that if you have been married or in a partnership for 30, 40, 50 and 60 years, like Jim McLeod and Joan McLeod—if you find yourself in this situation with your parents or your grandparents, surely we can agree that separating couples is cruel and it shouldn't be happening in Ontario. There are solutions around care campuses and around prioritizing reunification of couples. I urge my colleagues on the other side to give some consideration to calling that bill. Let's figure it out together. There are compassionate solutions. If the bill isn't perfect,

I accept that, but what I want to see and what seniors want to see is a plan to keep couples together as they age. Because they built this province, they paid their taxes and they deserve some dignity.

On the housing file, I do want to say that the need for deeply affordable and supportive housing is profound. We should not be content to see people in Canada living in tents and parks on the street. We absolutely can do better. And it's not going to get built by the private sector. So partnering with the not-for-profit sector, the co-op sector—there are solutions there. But they need a partner in the government of Ontario to do truly affordable housing and bring back—the revival of rent control in Ontario is so needed.

0910

In a housing crisis, we should at least be stabilizing the precarious housing that already exists right now. We know that the above-rent-guidelines ceiling has been breached so many times. And seniors are getting evicted in Ontario, which is just a shameful state of affairs.

On education: I want to point out that there is a systemic underfunding of public education in Ontario, which at this point seems very intentional. The latest announcement that happened last Friday is just another shell game of funding pockets that doesn't hide the fact that funding for education has not kept pace with inflation, and that the complex needs in our education system—we have a moral duty to see those children and to meet those needs. I would argue—and my colleague MPP Kernaghan—that investing in those resources pays off down the line, especially if children have an opportunity to meet their potential.

Stakeholders called for a full review of the funding model to ensure that funding addresses student needs. The last review was conducted in 2002. This is 2024. A firm commitment from the Minister of Education and finance minister to review where the money is going in education and where it is having the greatest impact—budget 2024 missed that moment, as well.

Just to connect it to the mental health piece, only one in 10 schools has regularly scheduled access to a mental health professional, while 95% of schools report needing some or more support for mental health. That's what we heard from people who came to committee, who travelled to committee, who took the time to develop a report for us. This is now year after year after year a call for reviewing the funding formula. The resistance of the government to do the basic financial due diligence on this issue is astounding for me and absolutely is impacting special education negatively—as well as the broken student transportation funding model.

The minister seems content to sort of dabble around the edges of the transportation funding model. What we heard from ACEPO, OCSTA and OPSBA is that transportation also is an equity issue, especially for children who live in rural and northern communities. Children shouldn't be on a bus, one way, for an hour and a half. We should agree on that.

I won't talk about the francophones at this point, because their level of frustration around not having a shortage of French-language teachers is ongoing, and they did warn us

that there will be a crisis in offering French-language education in Ontario.

Finally, on post-secondary education, I think it was really telling when we were in the Holiday Inn in Oakville and the Ontario council of universities came to depute. There was a leak happening in the ballroom. It was just a small leak at the beginning, and we sort of ignored it. Then, more rain came down, and it was getting kind of loud. And just at the moment when Steve Orsini, the CEO of the council of universities, stated, “The infrastructure in our universities is at a tipping point,” the ceiling fell down, and we had to suspend the deputants at that point. If he designed it that way, good for him. It was more than symbolic. I thought it had great meaning. There’s a reason why, at the University of Waterloo, they actually now have permanent placards that say, “This is where the bucket goes.” The infrastructure of our post-secondary institutions has been neglected for so long.

On infrastructure: The Good Roads association came forward with a very good suggestion around keeping our northern roads safe, and they also connected that investment to reducing health care costs, which is the way we should be thinking, I think, at this point in time.

And then, finally, for the love of humanity: Libraries are good institutions. They serve the public good. They make a difference in our communities. They are critical to ensuring access to valuable resources and programs. They are important for children all the way up to seniors. And the funding for our universities has not kept pace with inflationary pressures or the demand for library services. Libraries are like the anchors for so many small communities, and they have come every single year having not received a tangible increase in 25 years, but the government failed to meet this moment as well.

Finally, Chair, we filed a dissenting opinion for a reason. We don’t agree with the priorities of this government, which is very focused on building, but not resourcing the buildings. You’ll never open up a new hospital bed without a nurse. You can build all the schools you want, but without teachers or educational assistants or child and youth workers—that’s not part of the equation.

The overwhelming evidence was presented to suggest that without needed investment into human resources and other upstream services like health, education and the justice system across the province will be further compromised. We really did hope that the government would listen to those informed voices, but, alas, they did not.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): Further discussion? MPP Kernaghan.

Mr. Terence Kernaghan: I’d like to thank MPP Fife for her very impassioned words about what we heard throughout the province of Ontario. When we look at this budget and when we consider all of the people who came to present to committee, we have a moral duty to not only respond but also to act upon their recommendations.

Community Living presented at a number of different locations across Ontario. With their campaign #5toSurvive, they spoke about the peril within the development services sector and how they worry that this government is on track

to re-institutionalize people. We need to make sure that people have spaces within our community and also that people providing the care to those individuals within the community are paid accordingly. They have not seen increases in over 30 years.

But one theme that also came across loud and clear to the official opposition was the need for wage parity across health care sectors. So many folks, whether it is in the community services or community support services areas, are paid so dramatically low in comparison to people working in long-term care, people working in acute care. It is a system whereby the government has exploited the good nature and the good hearts of people working within those systems, expecting them to settle for less. That is something that the government has chosen not to address with budget 2024.

CMHA was asking for a 7% increase, and 2% of that request was geared to the provision of supportive housing, providing those critical wraparound supports that all communities across Ontario need, and yet this government has chosen to ignore that need for supportive housing.

The OMA was asking for administrative help for the 19 hours per week that are being wasted, which could be spent providing that primary care for those people who need it, and yet this government has ignored that completely.

ALS presented in a number of locations. They provided heartfelt testimony about people who are facing this terrible, terrible wasting disease, who want to spend those precious moments in time with their family, within their homes, and yet they are expected as an organization to fundraise. That is a disgrace. I can’t believe that the government would ignore people struggling and battling ALS. It is unconscionable, Chair.

0920

When we consider education, we heard testimonies about educators who are being attacked, educators who are being stabbed with pencils. The number of violent incidents that are occurring on a daily basis within the classroom is at a level we have never seen before, and yet within budget 2024, we’re talking about vape detectors and security cameras in hallways. That will not stop the issues that are happening within the classroom, and that is a need to make sure that kids have the mental health supports that they require and that education is funded properly. Educators within my community have spoken about having \$100 per year for supplies within their classroom. And this committee heard about the statutory benefit increases of CPP and EI that are legally required, which have caused huge holes within school board budgets, and this government has chosen not to make up that shortfall.

We’ve seen a really odious presentation about teacher—and I hate to use this word, because it is a judgmental word—but we’ve seen this government talk about teacher absenteeism, when that is not the issue. The issue is this government’s dramatic and conscious underfunding of the public education system. That people in the post-secondary field came to this committee and were begging to be average, in a province as rich as Ontario, the richest province in Canada, spending the least amount on post-secondary education, so low that we would have to increase by 43.5% to

simply be second last, should give us all pause. Yet we see an ideological opposition to investing in public education, which is deeply concerning.

Children's mental health came up again and again and again.

With housing, this government has the option to actually get into the business of building housing. Yet they would leave it to the private, for-profit industry, which has indicated time and again that they do not want to be responsible for the provision of affordable housing. That is the government's historic responsibility, and it's time they got back to what their mandate ought to be.

My colleague MPP Fife has mentioned the need to reestablish rent control. There are young professionals who will never be able to start their life because of this government's ideological distrust of this necessary thing, to make sure that people can afford life.

Health care privatization, libraries, museums, investments in the arts—we see this disgraceful investment in agency nurses. Chair, there are a number of things that this government has heard but has chosen not to respond to, and from the side of the official opposition, it is disappointing to say the least.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): Further questions or comments about the bill in general? MPP Oosterhoff.

Mr. Sam Oosterhoff: I won't speak long. I just want to say that I think this is a really important piece of legislation, as a member of a generation that had been abandoned by decades of Liberal mismanagement, of waste, of an ability to spend far beyond their limits and add on astronomical amounts of debt to future generations without providing meaningful investment in infrastructure, in cost-of-living relief. It's very encouraging for me to be able to come to this committee, on a temporary basis, and to participate on the clause-by-clause consideration of a plan that's going to continue to build a stronger future for my generation, for the generations coming after me, and do so in a sustainable way: a way that recognizes good stewardship of tax dollars, that invests in the critical infrastructure from health and education to social services in a way that's sustainable and ensures that my generations are still going to be able to enjoy the benefits that those who have come before us have been able to enjoy, and also does so in a way that is respectful of the cost-of-living concerns that face the province of Ontario and maintains changes to the gas tax to ensure that more money is being kept in people's pockets.

So I'm really pleased to be able to be here, and I want to just acknowledge and thank the committee for allowing me to come and support this crucial piece of legislation for the future of Ontario.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): Further discussion? No further?

As you will notice, Bill 180 is comprised of three sections and 10 schedules. In order to deal with the bill in an orderly fashion, I suggest that we postpone the first three sections of the bill in order to dispose of the schedules first. This allows the committee to consider the contents of the schedules before dealing with the sections on the commencement and the short title of the bill. We will return to the three

sections after completing considerations of the schedules. Is there unanimous consent to stand down the three sections of the bill and deal with the schedules first? Thank you very much. We will, then, now start the process here.

There are no amendments to schedule 1, sections 1 to 14, therefore we propose to bundle sections 1 to 14. Is there agreement? Agreed.

Is there any debate on schedule 1, sections 1 to 14? Are the members prepared to vote? All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is carried.

There's an NDP amendment on schedule 1. MPP Fife.

Ms. Catherine Fife: I move that schedule 1 to the bill be amended by adding the following section to the Building Ontario Fund Act, 2024:

“Limit re private, for-profit undertakings

“14.1 The corporation shall not enter into any arrangement for the financing of a private, for-profit undertaking that would be economically feasible without financing from the corporation.”

There's a small explanatory note here: This amendment to the bill would ensure that the Ontario Infrastructure Bank would not allow for public dollars to be used for private, for-profit projects that could otherwise get built.

I do want to say that there is a good reason for us to be moving forward with “economically” on infrastructure investments. We should be focused on investing public dollars in public projects where the private sector wouldn't be building it anyway. So ensuring that the dollars are going into, for instance, our Ontario homebuilding program—I think that this makes sense, given that we are running a \$9.8-billion operational deficit and that every dollar that's coming out of the Treasury Board should be invested into those projects that would not be normally built if the public financing wasn't available.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): Further debate on the new section? Shall amendment 1 carry? Any further discussion on the amendment? If there's no further discussion, shall I put the question on the amendment?

Ms. Catherine Fife: Sorry; just to clarify to government members: It's not worthwhile to allow costly, private financing to displace affordable, public financing for projects that are normally publicly financed, where the decision to build is supposed to be based on public priorities and not business priorities. This amendment seeks to clarify the goals of the bank, because there is some concern around the recently renamed infrastructure bank.

Chair, I'd like a recorded vote, please, on this one.

0930

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): Further discussion on the motion? Are the members prepared to vote?

Ayes

Fife, Kernaghan.

Nays

Anand, Bailey, Crawford, Harris, Oosterhoff, Triantafilopoulos.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): The amendment is lost.

There are no amendments to schedule 1, sections 15 to 36. Therefore, I propose that we bundle sections 15 to 36. Is there agreement? Agreed. Is there any debate on schedule 1, sections 15 to 36? If not, are the members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 1, sections 15 to 36, inclusive, carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Motion is carried.

Is there any debate on schedule 1? If not, are the members ready to vote? All those in favour of schedule 1? All those opposed? Schedule 1 carries.

Schedule 1.1: There's an NDP amendment.

Ms. Catherine Fife: This amendment to schedule 1.1 would essentially create an emergency room fund to keep emergency rooms open that would otherwise be shut down—

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): We need the amendment moved.

Ms. Catherine Fife: I'll read it first.

I move that schedule 1.1 be added to the bill:

“Definition

“1. In this act,

“‘Fund’ means the emergency room emergency fund established under section 2.

“Fund

“2. No longer than six months after the day this act comes into force, the Minister of Health shall establish an emergency room emergency fund.

“Objectives

“3. The fund's objective is to provide funding to keep open hospital emergency rooms that would otherwise be shut down due to a lack of funding.

“Board of directors

“4(1) A board of directors shall be established to manage and administer the fund.

“Members

“2) The board of directors shall be composed of at least three and not more than 11 members.

“Appointments

“3) The board of directors of the corporation shall be appointed at pleasure by the Lieutenant Governor in Council on the recommendation of the minister.

“Chair and vice-chair

“4) On the recommendation of the minister, the Lieutenant Governor in Council shall designate a chair from among the members of the board of directors and may designate a vice-chair from among the members of the board of directors.

“Same

“5) If the chair is absent or unable to act, or if the office of the chair is vacant, and a vice-chair has been designated, the vice-chair shall act as chair.

“Same

“6) If the chair is absent or unable to act and the vice-chair is absent or unable to act or no vice-chair has been designated, the members present shall appoint an acting chair from among themselves.

“Quorum

“7) A majority of the members constitutes a quorum of the board of directors.

“Remuneration and reimbursement

“(8) The members of the board of directors shall receive the remuneration and reimbursement for reasonable expenses that the Lieutenant Governor in Council determines.

“By-laws

“(5) Subject to the minister's approval, the board of directors may pass by-laws and resolutions regulating its proceedings and generally for the conduct and management of the affairs of the fund.

“Chief executive officer

“6(1) The board of directors shall appoint a chief executive officer.

“Same

“(2) The chief executive officer is responsible for the operation of the fund, subject to the supervision and direction of the board of directors.

“Remuneration and benefits

“(3) The fund shall pay remuneration and benefits to the chief executive officer as is determined by the board of directors, subject to the minister's approval.

“Employees

“7(1) The fund may employ or otherwise engage persons as it considers necessary for the proper conduct of the business of the fund.

“Agreements for provision of services

“(2) The fund may enter into agreements with any minister of the crown or chair of a crown agency for the provision of services to the fund by employees of the crown or employees of the crown agency, as the case may be.

“Pension benefits

“(3) The fund may provide its eligible employees with pension benefits under the Public Service Pension Plan if the fund is designated as an employer under the Public Service Pension Act.

“Remuneration and benefits

“(4) The fund shall pay such remuneration and benefits to employees of the fund as is determined by the board of directors, subject to the minister's approval.

“Powers

“8. Except as limited by this act, the fund has the capacity, rights, powers and privileges of a natural person for carrying out its objects.

“Investments, etc.

“9. Without limiting the generality of the fund's powers under section 8, the fund may,

“(a) make investments to carry out its objects, including by way of equity investment, loan, acquiring a derivative or giving a guarantee; and

“(b) acquire and hold, realize on or otherwise dispose of security or a security interest of any kind, including any interest or rights in real property or personal property as security for the due performance of any arrangement or agreement with the fund, and retain and use the proceeds of disposition.

“Commencement

“10. The act set out in this schedule comes into force on the day the Building a Better Ontario Act (Budget Measures), 2024 receives royal assent.

“Short title

“11. The short title of the act set out in this Schedule is the Emergency Room Emergency Fund Act, 2024.”

This may have kept Minden open, Chair. I look forward to the debate on this motion.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): To the members of the committee: The proposed amendment is out of order. Standing order number 60 states: “Any bill, resolution, motion or address, the passage of which would impose a tax or specifically direct the allocation of public funds, shall not be passed by the House unless recommended by a message from the Lieutenant Governor, and shall be proposed only by a minister of the crown.”

Furthermore, as Bosc and Gagnon note on page 772 of the third edition of the House of Commons Procedure and Practice, a motion is out of order if it infringes upon the financial initiative of the crown by imposing a charge on the public treasury.

I therefore rule the amendment out of order.

Moving forward, there are no amendments on schedule 2. Therefore, I propose that we bundle sections 1 and 2. Is there agreement? Do we have unanimous consent to agree? Any debate? If not, ready to vote? Shall schedule 2, sections 1 and 2, inclusive, carry? All those in favour? Opposed? Schedule 2, sections 1 and 2 carry.

Is there any debate on schedule 2? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? All those in favour? Opposed? The motion is carried.

There are no amendments on schedule 3. Therefore, I propose that we bundle sections 1 and 2. Is there agreement? Is there any debate on schedule 3, sections 1 and 2? If not, are the members ready to vote? All those in favour? All those opposed? Schedule 3, sections 1 and 2, inclusive, carry.

Is there any debate on schedule 3? Are the members ready to vote? All those in favour? All those opposed? Schedule 3 carries.

0940

There are no amendments to schedule 4. I therefore propose that we bundle sections 1 and 2. Is there agreement? Agreed. Is there any debate on schedule 4, sections 1 and 2? Are the members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 4, sections 1 and 2, inclusive, carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Carried.

Is there any debate on schedule 4? Are the members prepared to vote? All those in favour? All those opposed to schedule 4? The motion is carried. Schedule 4 carries.

There are no amendments to schedule 5. Therefore, I propose that we bundle sections 1 and 2. Is there agreement? Agreed. Is there any debate on schedule 5, sections 1 and 2? If not, all those in favour? Opposed? The motion is carried. Is there any debate on schedule 5? If not, are the members prepared to vote?

Mr. Stephen Crawford: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Anand, Bailey, Crawford, Harris, Oosterhoff, Triantafilopoulos.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): All those opposed? The motion is carried. Schedule 5 carries.

There are no amendments to schedule 6. I therefore propose that we bundle sections 1 and 2. Is there agreement? Agreed. Is there any debate on schedule 6, sections 1 and 2? Are the members prepared to vote? All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is carried.

Is there any debate on schedule 6? Are the members prepared to vote? All those in favour? All those opposed? Schedule 6 carries.

There are no amendments to schedule 7. I therefore propose that we bundle sections 1 to 4. Is there an agreement? Agreed. Is there any debate on schedule 7, sections 1 to 4? If not, are the members prepared to vote? All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is carried.

Is there any debate on schedule 7? If not, are the members prepared to vote? All those in favour? All those opposed? Schedule 7 carries.

There are no amendments to schedule 8. I therefore propose that we bundle sections 1 to 10. Is there agreement? Agreed. Is there any debate on schedule 8, sections 1 to 10? If not, are the members prepared to vote? All those in favour? Opposed? Schedule 8, sections 1 to 10, inclusive, carries.

Is there any debate on schedule 8? If not, are members prepared to vote? All those in favour? All those opposed? Schedule 8 carries.

There are no amendments to schedule 9. I therefore propose that we bundle sections 1 to 2. Is there agreement? Agreed. Is there any debate on schedule 9, sections 1 and 2? Are the members prepared to vote? Ready to vote. All those in favour of section 9, 1 and 2, inclusive? All those opposed? Carried.

Is there any debate on schedule 9? Are the members prepared to vote? All those in favour? All those opposed? Schedule 9 carries.

There are no amendments to schedule 10. I therefore propose that we bundle sections 1 to 2. Is there agreement? All those in favour? Agreed.

Is there any debate on schedule 10, sections 1 and 2? Are the members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 10, sections 1 and 2, inclusive, carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Schedule 10, sections 1 and 2 carry.

Is there any debate on schedule 10? Are the members prepared to vote? All those in favour? All those opposed? Schedule 10 carries.

That concludes the sections. We now go back to the earlier three.

Section 1: Any debate on section 1? Shall I call the question? Ready to vote? All in favour? Opposed on section 1? Section 1 carries.

Section 2: Any debate on section 2? Are the members ready to vote? All those in favour of section 2? All those opposed? Section 2 carries.

Section 3: Any debate on section 3? Are the members ready to vote? All those in favour of section 3? All those opposed? Section 3 carries.

The title of the bill: Any discussion on the title of the bill? Are the members ready to vote? All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Shall Bill 180 carry? Any discussion? If not, all those

in favour? Opposed? Bill 180 carries.

Shall I report the bill to the House? Any discussion? If not, shall I call the questions? All those in favour? All those opposed? I shall report the bill to the House.

Thank you, all—I don't even need notes for this. Thank you, all. That concludes the business of the clause-by-clause on Bill 180. Thank you all for your participation.

The committee adjourned at 0951.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

Chair / Président

Mr. Ernie Hardeman (Oxford PC)

Vice-Chair / Vice-Présidente

Ms. Catherine Fife (Waterloo ND)

Mr. Deepak Anand (Mississauga–Malton PC)

Ms. Patrice Barnes (Ajax PC)

Mr. Stephen Crawford (Oakville PC)

Ms. Catherine Fife (Waterloo ND)

Mr. Ernie Hardeman (Oxford PC)

Mr. Mike Harris (Kitchener–Conestoga PC)

MPP Andrea Hazell (Scarborough–Guildwood L)

Ms. Christine Hogarth (Etobicoke–Lakeshore PC)

Mr. Terence Kernaghan (London North Centre / London-Centre-Nord ND)

Ms. Effie J. Triantafilopoulos (Oakville North–Burlington / Oakville-Nord–Burlington PC)

Substitutions / Membres remplaçants

Mr. Robert Bailey (Sarnia–Lambton PC)

Mr. Sam Oosterhoff (Niagara West / Niagara-Ouest PC)

Clerk / Greffière

Ms. Vanessa Kattar

Staff / Personnel

Ms. Tara Partington, legislative counsel